

REMARKS

The citation of a reference that teaches nothing about what is claimed and the assertion that what is claimed is nonetheless obvious, fails to make out a *prima facie* rejection. Certainly, the proposition that substituting inductors for resistors in voltage dividers is completely unsupported and seems illogical.

Moreover, there is no suggestion that the claimed circuit needed a voltage divider. Moreover, the use of an inductor would result in the biasing of the transistor with a voltage based on the change in current through the inductor. No such operation is suggested in the cited reference, nor is there any reason within the cited reference to provide what is claimed.

Therefore, reconsideration should be undertaken.

Claim 10 calls for AC coupling a shunt resistor to the transistor. No such thing is shown in the cited reference.

Claim 11 calls for providing a pair of parallel shunt resistors coupled to said transistor. There would be no reason to do this since the inductor and the resistor already divide the voltage adequately, according to the office action. Thus, nothing from within the cited reference would teach any reason to do what is claimed in claim 11.

Likewise, claim 24 calls for coupling the capacitor in series with said resistor. If all that is being done is dividing voltage, there would be no reason to do this as well.

Therefore, reconsideration of each of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 7, 2008


Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation